

# SCIENCE & GOVERNMENT REPORT

26th Year of Publication

The Independent Bulletin of Science Policy

Volume XXVI, No. 10

P. O. Box 6226A, Washington, D. C. 20015

© June 1, 1996

## NIH in Transition: Revamping Intramural Research

*Long regarded as the world's preeminent biomedical research complex, the inhouse, or intramural, sector of the National Institutes of Health was down in the ratings, deemed inbred, soft and complacent, when Harold Varmus was appointed NIH Director in 1993. Academic scientists were looking covetously at intramural's \$1.2 billion share of NIH's \$11 billion budget. In one of his first major moves, Varmus filled the post of Deputy Director for Intramural Research with the appointment of Michael M. Gottesman, an NIH veteran and head of the Laboratory of Cell Biology in the National Cancer Institute—a research post he still retains. Gottesman's appointment came with a mandate to restore NIH's scientific glory, and ever since the great Bethesda, Md., campus has been rumbling with change. Gottesman spoke with SGR Editor Greenberg on May 20. Following is the text, transcribed and edited by SGR.*

**SGR.** *You're downsizing and more.*

**Gottesman.** There's an element of downsizing, but mostly what we're interested in is making sure that the quality of science in the intramural program is beyond reproach, that it is the very highest quality available any place, that this is the top biomedical research institution in the world.

**SGR.** *We've always been told that it is.*

### Ouster Vote Under Way at NAE—P. 2 Pay Check: Psychological Assoc.—P. 5

**Gottesman.** We want to be sure that it remains so.

**SGR.** *Have there been concerns that things are slipping?*

**Gottesman.** I think at the time of the *Report of the External Advisory Committee* [an outside group that examined the intramural program in 1994], there was some concern, particularly by extramural scientists, that some of the practices in the intramural program had allowed the quality of science to slip. There were questions about the nature of the review process here, which had always been fairly stringent but has now become much more rigorous.

**SGR.** *What had gone wrong?*

**Gottesman.** There was a sense that we were a bit resting on our very distinguished laurels; that some of the people who were coming in to review the program didn't have a particular interest or desire to help us make changes in the program.

**SGR.** *Why wouldn't they want to help?*

**Gottesman.** This is a perception that people had. It certainly is not correct. But it was a perception.

**SGR.** *That some of the outside reviewers didn't want to bear down?*

**Gottesman.** No, I think that some of the outside reviewers

had the sense that the intramural program was pretty much established and that not very much of what they could do will change it. And one of my jobs has been to convince them that we are very serious about the review process. We've done a number of things in terms of using [outside] Boards of Scientific Counselors. The process basically consists of a retrospective review for every laboratory, tenured scientist and principal investigator. In principle, it's mostly retrospective, but the process has become about two-thirds retrospective and one-third prospective. And that's one of the things that we've clarified, so that the expectation is that the person will be judged on the quality of the work they've done for the past four years, but that the decision to recommend future funding at the same level or increased or decreased

*(Continued on Page 3)*

## In Brief

Who are the two Congressmen whose dim remarks about research regularly make the rounds in Washington? SGR of May 15 said they're "unfindable," but thanks to alert readers, so far that's only half true. First the assertion that the National Weather Service is unneeded because "85 to 90 percent" of newspapers, TV and radio stations "receive their weather information from private sector companies." Credit that to Republican freshman Dick Chrysler of Lansing, Michigan, as recorded in the text of a House Science Committee hearing September 12, 1995. Informed that the firms get their stuff from the Weather Service, Chrysler replied, "I don't know, I don't know."

Then there's the Congressman, referred to by National Academy of Sciences President Bruce Alberts, who allegedly said the "government should stop supporting scientific research, inasmuch as all of the universities are doing it anyway." A spokesperson for Alberts said the remark was reported to him by Rep. John Porter (R-Ill.), champion of NIH, as evidence of the need for missionary work. Porter's office confirmed that account, but said Porter discreetly refrains from identifying the source.

The latest budget plans from the President and the House "suggest difficult times ahead for the science and engineering community," according to the American Association for the Advancement of Science. Taking inflation into account, by 2002 both would reduce non-defense R&D nearly 25 percent below the 1995 level.

With the National Cancer Institute as matchmaker, an agreement establishing the Middle East Cancer Consortium was signed May 20 by Cyprus, Egypt, Israel, Jordan and the Palestinian Authority, providing for cooperative activities in research, training, data collection, etc.

## Academy of Engineering Voting on Presidential Ouster

Armed with a new recall provision, the Council of the National Academy of Engineering has taken the next step and asked the membership to approve the removal of President Harold Liebowitz, who won the office last year on a vow to invigorate the quiescent institution [SGR, May 15: "Step Toward Ousting NAE Head Passes, 1145-196"]. The ballots, by mail, are due by June 23.

Liebowitz responded with a mailed questionnaire asking the Academy's 1800 members to check "yes" or "no" on various questions, including "Should Liebowitz step down?" and "Should the Council step down?"

Mailed May 14, the Liebowitz "poll," as he calls it, was accompanied by a copy of the platform on which he was elected and a "Dear Colleague" letter stating that "the Council refuses to acknowledge that their candidate lost the presidential election." The letter went on to restate Liebowitz's assertion that the Council is seeking his ouster because he wants to extricate the NAE from its "present subservient position" as an affiliate of the National Academy of Sciences. "Because they disagree with my policies," Liebowitz declared, "I am incompetent. Because they obstruct my platform, I am a failure."

In its communication to the members, the Council fired a barrage of allegations against Liebowitz, accusing him of creating "constant confusion and turmoil," demoralizing the staff to the point where senior members are threatening to resign, and ignoring the Council's policy mandates. Under Liebowitz, the Council charged, the "NAE fundraising program is moribund"—a serious matter, given the shaky state of NAE finances.

The Council also advised the membership of previously whispered details of its salary negotiations with Liebowitz, reporting that, upon his election, he rejected a compensation package identical to that of his predecessor—" \$270,000 annual salary, a leased car for business and personal use, and a \$30,000 discretionary fund for expenses incurred for NAE business."

"Instead," the Council reported, "he asked for a total of \$300,000 in salary and deferred compensation, and stated that he would require a car and driver." The Council added that Liebowitz wanted the NAE to purchase an apartment for an estimated \$600,000 for his occupancy in the Watergate Apartments—where the President of the National Academy of Sciences, Bruce Alberts, occupies an Academy-owned apartment. (The Council did not note that, on this point, Liebowitz asks, If him, why not me?)

As an alternative to purchase by the NAE, the Council stated, Liebowitz requested an interest-free loan for his personal purchase of an apartment at the Watergate, one of Washington's priciest locales. Under this real-estate scheme, the NAE would pay the monthly maintenance fees, of about \$40,000 a year, and Liebowitz's discretionary fund would be raised to \$73,000 to accommodate his plans for official entertaining, according to the Council. The Council said it

rejected all of Liebowitz's proposals for compensation and housing.

Continuing with its report, the Council stated that Liebowitz subsequently bought an apartment at the Watergate with his own funds and sent the monthly bills to the Academy—"which was an embarrassment to the NAE Council, given its explicit decision in the matter." The charges have not been paid, the members were advised.

The report adds, "The NAE is leaderless, is in peril as an organization, and needs a new President to do the job that NAE Presidents are elected and well paid to do."

Brimming with denunciations of Liebowitz, the Council report, running 13 pages, concedes a major point to him in a brief passage on page 12 concerning revision of the NAE's nomination and election procedures—a sore topic for Liebowitz.

In 1991, after the NAE Nominating Committee refused him a place on the ballot, Liebowitz campaigned as a petition candidate and won 43 percent of vote against the only candidate approved by the Committee, incumbent Robert White. In 1995, despite that hefty vote, the Nominating Committee again rejected Liebowitz. Taking the petition route again, he charged that the NAE was run by a clique beyond control of the members—and won, 697-660.

Without acknowledging this unpleasant episode in NAE history, the Council's report to the members stated that "the Council recognizes that many members believe that past procedures for nominating and electing officers is [sic] too closed and does not permit adequate membership participation, especially in the nomination process." To remedy this, the Council proposed broadly based selection "of the large majority of" the Nominating Committee.

The Council said that if the members vote to remove Liebowitz, it wants to devote part of the coming fall membership meeting to an open discussion "of the characteristics that the next President should possess." It added that its aim is "to have a new President in place by the end of December 1996 or as soon thereafter as possible."

Liebowitz has denounced the recall move as illegal and says that he will carry the fight to court if the vote goes against him.

---

© 1996, Science & Government Report, Inc.

Editor and Publisher  
Daniel S. Greenberg

Associate Publisher  
Wanda J. Reif

Circulation Manager  
Glen D. Grant

Published by Science & Government Report, Inc., twice monthly, except once each in January, July, August, and September. Annual subscriptions: Institutions, \$490.00 (two years, \$840.00). Bulk and individual rates upon request. Editorial offices at 3736 Kanawha St. NW, Washington, DC 20015. Tel. (202) 244-4135. For subscription service: PO Box 6226A, Washington, DC 20015. Tel. 1-800-522-1970; in Washington, DC 785-5054. Reproduction without permission is prohibited. SGR is available on University Microfilms International. Claims for missing back issues will be filled without charge if made within six weeks of publication date. ISSN 0048-9581.

## ... Closing Labs and Recognizing Neglected 'Gems'

(Continued from Page 1)

level will depend to some extent on what they're planning to do in the next four years. The Boards of Scientific Counselors had previously been selected in various ways in the institutes. Now we've made it clear that the decision as to who is going to be on the Board is made by the institute Director after discussions with Dr. Varmus and myself. The Scientific Directors [of the institutes] are not involved in the decisions.

**SGR.** Why not?

**Gottesman.** These are advisory boards, and they have to be free from any entanglements with the Scientific Directors, because it's the Scientific Directors' programs that are being evaluated. The composition of the Boards in many cases is not changing dramatically, but is changing.

**SGR.** With what results?

**Gottesman.** We're getting very rigorous and frank reviews. The impact has been quite substantial. People have been recommended for reductions in support, laboratories have been closed, and some scientists who have not been enjoying particular support have been recognized as gems and their resources have been increased.

**SGR.** What laboratories have been closed and why?

**Gottesman.** I can't give you that off the top of my head. We recently had a Congressional inquiry about what they were, and we elaborated them. But there are quite a few labs that have been closed.

**SGR.** Has the list of the closed laboratories been sent to the Congress?

**Gottesman.** Not specifically, because there's a lot of personnel information—

**SGR.** Is this a matter of embarrassment to the individuals involved? I should think you'd know which laboratories have been demolished.

**Gottesman.** The laboratory chief certainly knows if that's the case. It could be a matter of a little bit of concern. It certainly reflects, sometimes reflects, on the stewardship of the lab chief. Sometimes it reflects just on the programmatic need of the institute.

[Editor's note: Following the interview, SGR submitted a Freedom of Information request to NIH for a list of labs terminated since 1993.]

**SGR.** Some academic scientists say they're subject to a competitive rigor that people here are shielded from.

**Gottesman.** The review process here is as rigorous as it is anywhere else. Basically, all the reviews are based on fairly intensive site visits, written reports. Although the process is somewhat different in concept, because it's retrospective, it's no less rigorous.

**SGR.** Do the people here succeed one out of four times in applying for support? That's said to be the batting average for extramural applicants.

**Gottesman.** The more appropriate statistic would be for established scientists on the outside. Once we've chosen scientists to be permanent, they've gone through a rigorous

review process. How often does an outside established scientist lose all research support? We don't have good statistics on that. But it's not 75 percent of the time. It's a few percent. And at least a few percent of the time, based on the review process, NIH scientists lose significant resources and sometimes lose all resources and so cannot continue to work.

**SGR.** What happens to them after that?

**Gottesman.** The problem of what to do with scientists who become non-productive is not limited to the intramural program. Universities have to face this problem as well. There are a variety of things. A very creative Scientific Director [of an institute] can usually convince people that it's time for them to move on in their careers. Sometimes they leave the NIH and enter other jobs, usually within the sciences, but often other professions. Sometimes they can find very useful things to do within the intramural program or the extramural program. I don't want to give you the impression that what we do with our failed intramural scientists is put them in [other jobs] in the intramural program—that couldn't be further from the truth. But there are a variety of things that people can do, including, as appropriate, retirement.

**SGR.** Is the intramural program becoming smaller?

**Gottesman.** NIH has gotten smaller with respect to full-time-equivalent positions (FTEs). Since the time of the [1994 External Advisory] report, we've had about a 10 percent reduction in FTEs. I won't say that was entirely driven by the report. That was mostly driven by the general downsizing in government. And NIH has taken its share of reductions. To some extent, the process that we've put in place with respect to scientific review has made the decisions about downsizing easier. These are not across-the-board cuts. These have been specific cuts depending on the review process that we've initiated. This is a rational process.

**SGR.** How much further will this process go?

**Gottesman.** Our projection is that by the year 1999, there will be no more than a 5 percent additional reduction in the intramural program.

**SGR.** How many professionals will that leave here?

**Gottesman.** There are about 6500 FTEs at the NIH. So, the additional reduction will leave 5500 or 5700. There are all kinds of people in the intramural program. The program is not very heavy on administrators. Most of the people are lab-based scientists and support people for scientific staff.

**SGR.** What's changed in the rules of appointment and tenure?

**Gottesman.** Those have changed rather dramatically in two important ways. The first is that we've tried to define very clearly at NIH something which academicians know as the tenure track. There are still permanent appointments at the NIH, but there's a track that people have to enter in order to eventually achieve tenure at a more junior level of science. And that's a six-year track, in which, as the result of a rather

(Continued on Page 4)



## ... New Salary Ranges Are Closing the NIH Pay Gap

(Continued from Page 3)

extensive search process, we identify candidates for tenure track. They're entered into the track, and they're reviewed by their Scientific Directors on a yearly basis, and by the outside boards twice before a tenure decision is made: once at the mid-point, about three years after they arrive, and once before they are tenured or told they have a year—not to stay.

The process at that point is that a Promotion and Tenure Committee, which is institute-based, reviews the candidate if the Scientific Director feels the person is ready for tenure, and solicits outside letters. And we normally ask for 12 to 15 letters from outside scientists who are not collaborators, who are not former members of the institute, but are in fact independent evaluators; a process not unlike the tenure process at a major university. Once those are collected, the Promotion and Tenure Committee recommends to a Central Tenure Committee that the person be given tenure, or not. If not, it goes no further. The Central Tenure Committee consists of senior scientific representatives from the entire campus. Their recommendations are given to me as the Deputy Director for Intramural Research, to approve or not to approve the tenure process. When we began this process, we were finding that only about two-thirds of the recommended people were meeting the very high standards of the Central Tenure Committee. We're up now to about 85 percent for being granted tenure.

**SGR.** When you bring in people on this tenure track, is it with the idea that they will join an existing team, or that they will undertake their own program?

**Gottesman.** The idea is that they will be fully independent scientists. In some laboratories, they will be much more integrated into the life of the laboratory. For example, if it's a cardiology branch, they might be looking for somebody who's interested in working on some aspect of the heart. If it's the laboratory of molecular biology in the neurology institute, they may want a good molecular biologist who's interested in problems in basic neurobiology.

**SGR.** What distinguishes the intramural program from what goes on in a university? Why a government laboratory?

**Gottesman.** In terms of the science which is done here, there aren't enormous differences. We do investigator-initiated research of the highest quality. The strategies that intramural scientists use are somewhat different, because they're judged retrospectively, rather than prospectively. So, the likelihood of beginning far more adventurous science, highly creative and innovative science, we feel, is a bit higher in the intramural program. The only way to prove that would be to look at the kinds of products that we've had in the intramural program, and I think there's a lot of evidence that it is indeed true, that there's research being done here that would be hard to support by a purely prospective mechanism.

**SGR.** What's an example of that?

**Gottesman.** The classic example is Marshall Nirenberg's work on the genetic code. Some of the work that was done

on HIV was begun very quickly in the intramural program, when the extramural community was just beginning to gear up. The first artificial heart valve was implanted in the intramural program. The first use of combination chemotherapy to treat cancer—actually, the first treatment of cancer with chemotherapy was in the intramural program. A more recent example: hydroxy urea as a way of treating sickle cell disease. I think, to a great extent, clinical research, which depends on this wonderful marriage between the basic science labs and the beds in the intramural Clinical Center, is a relatively unique aspect of the intramural program. Other places also do excellent clinical research, but we have a lot of basic scientists and a lot of clinical scientists, and some of them are the same people, and that's a marriage that allows translation of research very quickly from the bench to the bed.

**SGR.** How do you stand in salary competition?

**Gottesman.** I think the situation at NIH has gotten much better. One of the concerns raised by the External Advisors was the discrepancy between pay scales for physicians and non-physicians in the intramural program. We have two new authorities that we've been using very effectively for recruitment purposes. One is called the Senior Biomedical Research Service, which allows us to pay salaries up to \$148,000 to people who have PhDs. Those are significant pay increases. And that's usually sufficient to recruit basic scientists into the intramural program. It may not be as high as some universities, but it's comparable.

In addition, we have an authority that has always been available to the Veterans Administration and a number of other government agencies, which has not been available to us until this year. Using this, the highest scale we can get up to is about \$200,000 a year. That allows us to supplement salaries for physicians doing clinical service activities.

**SGR.** Are there people here receiving \$200,000 a year?

**Gottesman.** I believe that we've just gotten approval. I'm not sure it's all the way through yet. It would just be a handful of people.

**SGR.** The advisory review of the intramural program said its budget has been at about 11.3 percent of the total NIH budget for a decade and should remain there.

**Gottesman.** We're now down to 10.5 percent. We've gone down steadily since the report. The President's projections for '97 are actually for a decrease in the intramural budget, which is the first time in the history of the intramural program. And that will bring us down to somewhere below 10.5 percent of the total NIH budget.

Over the last few years, it's clear that in order to preserve extramural research project grants and various other requirements of extramural scientists, the intramural program has begun to be reduced proportionately. Until the '97 President's budget, there hasn't been an actual reduction in the program, but it has been at a lower level of increase than the extramural

(Continued on Page 5)

## Non-Profit Pay Checks

### *American Psychological Association*

Membership totals and revenues have been close to flat in recent years at the American Psychological Association. The same is true of remuneration at the APA, the largest society of clinical and academic psychologists—with the exception of Raymond Fowler, Chief Executive Officer since 1990.

Fowler's direct compensation has remained in the low \$200,000 range since 1992. But in the category of contribution to employee benefits and deferred compensation, the numbers are astronomical in comparison to the figures for other APA employees, all of whom received less than \$4000 in benefits and deferred compensation.

The tax returns for APA list Fowler's 1995 compensation as \$208,650, plus employee benefits and deferred compensation of \$56,563 and \$3522 for expenses.

He did better in 1994, according to the tax records, receiving \$210,248 in compensation, \$119,286 in benefits and deferred compensation and \$4073 for expenses.

In 1993, Fowler's compensation was at the 1995 level, \$208,650, with \$83,460 in benefits and deferred compensation, and \$4645 in expenses. The figures for 1992 were virtually the same.

The IRS form 990, the publicly available source of non-profit financial data, requires listing of pay, benefits, and expenses of officers, directors and trustees and the five highest-paid employees. Fowler is the only one listed in the officer, etc., category. With several senior employees receiving identical compensation in 1995, the latest APA return lists seven of them, as follows:

Joanne E. Callan, Executive Director of the Education Directorate, who left APA in the fall of 1995. Her compensation for that year was reported at \$236,076, plus \$3960 in benefits, etc. and \$640 for expenses. An APA spokesperson said the compensation figure for 1995 was increased by unused sick leave and vacation time. In 1994, Callan's compensation was \$151,588, with benefits, etc., of \$3855

and expenses of \$960. In 1993, the comparable figures were \$153,981, \$3741, and \$1020.

James McHuge, General Counsel, received \$149,600 in compensation in 1995, no benefits, and \$960 in expenses. McHugh, who joined the APA staff in December 1993, was not listed among the top five salaried employees in 1994.

Charles McKay, Chief Financial Officer, \$140,000 in compensation in 1995, \$3960 in benefits, etc., and \$4185 in expenses. In 1994, McKay received \$160,271 in compensation, \$3855 in benefits, etc., and \$2846 in expenses. The figures for 1993 were \$143,517 in compensation, \$3741 in benefits, etc., and \$3075 in expenses.

Henry Tomes, Executive Director for Public Interest, received \$140,000 in compensation in 1995, \$3960 in benefits, etc., and \$960 in expenses. In 1993 and 1994, compensation and benefits for Tomes were virtually the same, but no expenses were listed.

Russell S. Newman, Executive Director for Practice, \$140,000 in compensation in 1995, plus \$3960 in benefits, etc., and \$960 in expenses. For 1994, Newman's compensation was reported at \$151,517, with \$3855 in benefits, etc., and \$960 in expenses. In 1993, he received \$143,906 in compensation, with benefits, etc., and expenses very similar to 1994-95.

William C. Howell, Executive Director for Science, received \$140,000 in compensation in 1995, \$3960 in benefits, etc., and \$960 in expenses. The numbers were almost identical for the previous two years.

Gary VandenBos, Executive Director for Communications, received \$140,000 in compensation in 1995, plus \$3960 in benefits, etc., and \$960 in expenses. He was not

(Continued on Page 6)

## NIH Intramural

(Continued from Page 4)

program. So, we've sort of gradually come down.

**SGR.** The intramural program at the National Cancer Institute is being substantially reduced.

**Gottesman.** NCI is being substantially reduced and NIMH [National Institute of Mental Health] is currently under review. We started, interestingly, with the two institutes that had large intramural programs that seemed to be in need of evaluation. NCI is completed. NIMH is beginning.

**SGR.** As intramural shrinks financially, does extramural benefit?

**Gottesman.** At NCI, some of the money that was taken out of the intramural program was used to support RO1 [extramural] grants in the NCI. It's palpable, it's tangible. The extramural community is delighted about it. And Dr. [Richard] Klausner [Director of NCI] has managed to do that while preserving the integrity of the intramural program.

## ACS Goofed on Tax Return

After a senior employee of the American Chemical Society indignantly told SGR last week that his income was understated in the *Pay Check* report of May 15, the ACS acknowledged that it had filed erroneous data on its IRS form 990 for 1994, the source of SGR's information. The discrepancy was attributed to "a clerical error" in reporting remuneration of the ACS's five highest-paid employees, all Division Directors.

The new information provided by ACS—covering compensation and contributions to employee benefit plans—is as follows, with the previously supplied, erroneous numbers in brackets:

Robert J. Massie, \$239,062; \$74,004; [\$212,500; \$52,919].

James E. Lohr, \$153,807; \$80,776; [\$156,487; \$37,075].

Ronald L. Wigington, who retired in mid-1994, \$191,295; \$18,247; [\$94,154; \$63,641].

Robert H. Marks, \$167,214; \$23,011; [\$139,590; \$16,295].

Suzan A. Brown, \$146,923; \$29,221; [\$137,529; \$15,622].

## ... PhD Membership Steady Over Past Few Years

(Continued from Page 5)

listed among the top five in 1994. In 1993, VandenBos's compensation was reported at \$143,517, plus \$3741 in benefits, etc., and \$3820 in expenses.

Asked to explain the occasional backsliding in salaries, an APA spokesperson told SGR that "salaries are adjusted to alleviate budget shortfalls. If next year is going to be tight," she said, "they might take an increase in this budget year."

Full-fledged APA membership has plateaued in recent years. The doctoral-level membership stood at 76,570 in 1993, rose to 80,810 in 1994, and then slipped to 79,098 in 1995, the year of APA's latest tax return, previewed by SGR prior to filing on May 31. During those three years, APA fared considerably better in expanding the ranks of student and affiliate members, with their combined totals for each successive year rising from 41,430 to 43,190 and 52,902. But doctoral-level memberships are by far the bigger revenue producers, currently priced at \$195 each, whereas most of the others are in the \$20-28 range.

All of APA's sources of income together amounted to \$48,548,793 in 1993; \$54,629,966 in 1994, and \$59,930,526 in 1995. For 1996, revenues are estimated at \$60,525,000.

APA derives the bulk of its income from publishing activities that include 26 journals, one to two dozen books per year, and its monthly newspaper, *APA Monitor*, which, like many inhouse journals, provides a forum for the salaried bureaucracy to extol its performance to the membership.

In the Washington non-profit community, APA is renowned for its fratricidal inhouse politics. Last year, APA

paid \$80,000 to cover the legal fees of a former APA officer, Professor Lewis Lipsitt of Brown University, whose 1994 run for the APA presidency was openly opposed by APA senior staff members. The settlement precluded a law suit against APA by Lipsitt, who had many grievances against the organization. [SGR, June 1, 1995: "APA Buys Legal Peace With \$80,000 Settlement."] An apparently substantial though unknown number of members resigned in protest, accusing the staff of underhanded tactics against Lipsitt, who formerly headed the APA Science Directorate.

In 1989, protesting what they regarded as APA's neglect of research, a group of academic members broke away and founded the American Psychological Society, which now numbers 16,000 members, virtually all academics. APA says that its PhD membership includes 15,000 academics.

The APA reported lobbying expenses of \$272,606 for 1995 and \$264,346 for 1994, high figures in comparison to the amounts for lobbying reported by other professional non-profits. The tax returns do not provide details of the lobbying. APA, in addition to drumbeating for federal research support, is regularly engaged in clinical turf battles with medical psychiatrists and has also been waging a losing fight to secure drug-prescribing rights for psychologists.

[Previously published *Non-Profit Pay Checks*: Howard Hughes Medical Institute, April 15; National Academy of Sciences, May 1; American Chemical Society, May 15.]

### Next: American Association for the Advancement of Science

## Job Changes & Appointments

**Richard Zare**, Professor of Chemistry at Stanford University, was elected Chairman of the National Science Board (NSB), the policymaking body of the National Science Foundation, at the May 9-10 meeting. He succeeds **Frank H.T. Rhodes**, President emeritus of Cornell University, whose term on the Board runs to May 1998. Membership consists of 24 eminences of academe, industry, etc., plus, *ex officio*, the Director of NSF. **Diana S. Natalicio**, President of the University of Texas, El Paso, was elected Vice Chairman, succeeding **Marye Anne Fox**, Vice President for Research, University of Texas, Austin, one of eight whose terms on the NSB expired May 10. In this as in other Administrations, the White House tends to be slow with such appointments. Also to be filled is a long-standing vacancy on the Board, which must approve all awards over \$3 million per year or \$15 million over the life of the award. With 13 constituting a quorum, and only 16 members at present, the Board is close to the edge.

**Karl N. Stauber** plans to step down June 17 as Under Secretary of Agriculture for Research, Education and Economics to become President of the Northwest Area Foundation, St. Paul, Minnesota, which promotes economic development in the surrounding eight-state region. He succeeds

**Terry Saario**, who says she is taking off six months before deciding on a next step. Stauber, who wasn't thriving in Washington politics, was a Vice President at the Foundation from 1986-93.

At the Association of American Medical Colleges: **David Witter Jr.** has been appointed Director of the Clinical-Administrative Data Service in the Association's Center for the Assessment and Management of Change in Academic Medicine. Witter formerly headed the Academic Medical Center Consortium in Rochester, NY, where he directed development of a data base, which was recently donated to the AAMC. **David Rodbard**, former Director of the Division of Computer Research and Technology at the National Institutes of Health, has been appointed Director of the AAMC's information resources outreach and liaison activities, which focus on assisting medical schools and hospitals in utilizing information resources.

At the Norwegian Embassy in Washington, **Tore Li**, a science-policy specialist in the Ministry of Education, Research and Church Affairs, has been appointed Science Counselor, effective in August, succeeding **Gunnar Wilhelmsen**, who returned to Norway in January to become Managing Director of the Center for Soil and Environmental Research.



## In Print

(Continued from Page 8)

### From the General Accounting Office (GAO), no charge:

**Food Safety: Information on Foodborne Illnesses** (GAP/RCED-96-96; 31 pp.), says the volume of such illnesses, from trivial to fatal, is growing. But monitoring systems, the GAO concluded, are inadequate, as evidenced by wild case estimates, ranging from 6.5 million to 81 million with costs ranging between \$5 billion and \$22 billion; one figure for the death toll is 9100 a year. But no one knows, and without better data, the GAO states, safety strategies are difficult to design. Moreover, the GAO warns, pathogens are turning up in unexpected parts of the food supply, including *Salmonella* "in foods that the public does not usually consider to be a potential source of illness, such as ice cream, tomatoes, melons, alfalfa sprouts, and orange juice." The report notes that, in collaboration with state authorities, the CDC, FDA and Food Safety and Inspection Service of the Department of Agriculture began tracking major foodborne bacterial pathogens last July in five areas—Metropolitan Atlanta, two Northern California counties, two Connecticut counties, and the states of Minnesota and Oregon. The federal agencies, the report adds, have expressed concern about their ability to continue funding the project over the long period needed to collect useful trend data.

**Federal Personnel: Issues on the Need for the Public Health Service's Commissioned Corps** (GAO/IGD-96-55; 45 pp.), responding to an inquiry from the House Budget Committee, the GAO says the 6276 commissioned officers in the Public Health Service last year cost the government a premium of \$130 million in special pay, allowances, bonuses, tax preferences, and retirement costs. Civilians already perform many health-related duties for the PHS, and could do all of them, at greatly reduced costs, the report states. While the report was in draft form, the Department of Health and Human Services responded that elimination of the uniformed corps would cause a disruptive retirement stampede and one-time transition costs of at least \$575 million—a figure disputed by the GAO.

**Military Exports: Offset Demands Continue to Grow** (GAO/NSIAD-96-65; 36 pp.), reports that over the past decade, foreign sales of US military goods and services have been accompanied by some \$84 billion in offset agreements—defined as inducements or conditions for promoting sales. Terms differ according to the industrial and economic needs of the purchasers, the GAO reports, but in general, "Countries are requiring more technology transfer, higher offset percentages, and higher local content requirements to offset their foreign military purchases." Critics of offsets, the GAO points out, warn that they're fostering competition; company officials respond they need them to make sales. The report summarizes the offset policies and practices of Canada, The Netherlands, Spain, UK, Singapore, South Korea, Taiwan, Kuwait, Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates.

Order from: USGAO, PO Box 6015, Gaithersburg, Md., 20884-6015; tel. 202/512-6000; fax 301/258-4066.

### From the Department of Defense, Ballistic Missile Defense Organization (BMDO):

**BMDO Technology Applications in Biomedicine** (96 pp., no charge), describes the work of some 70 companies and several government labs on biomedical technologies originating in research sponsored by BMDO, successor to the Strategic Defense Initiative, also known as Star Wars. The report, in a beautifully printed, colorful format, says there's a similarity between detecting and treating cancer cells and identifying and destroying missiles—and then it's off and running with a long list of existing, "emerging" and "enabling" technologies, including lasers, ultrasound, particle-beam and infrared devices and exotic materials. Contacts are given for each project. Technology transfer, or "spinoff," from military to civilian sectors formerly was claimed as a bonus from defense spending. In recent times, ironically, the Pentagon, citing slumping budgets, says it must increasingly rely on the civilian R&D sector for advanced technologies that can also underpin "dual use" products for the military services.

Order from: BMDO Technology Applications Office, c/o National Technology Transfer Center, Washington Operations, Department P, 2121 Eisenhower Ave., Suite 400, Alexandria, Va. 22314; tel. 703/518-8800, ext. 229; fax 703/518-8986; e-mail <zettler@nttc.edu>.

### From RAND, the California-headquartered think tank:

**RAND Research in Brief: 1995** (113 pp., no charge), a selection of research abstracts under the broad headings of Civil Justice, Education, Health and Drug Problems, Labor and Population, Public Expenditures, plus several on national security.

Order from: RAND Distribution Services, 1700 Main St., PO Box 2138, Santa Monica, California 90407-2138; tel. 310/451-7002; fax 310/451-6915; abstracts are on the World Wide Web: <<http://www.rand.org>>.

## To Order or Renew

Science & Government Report  
Northwest Station, Box 6226A  
Washington, D.C. 20015

☐ Renew my subscription ☐ Enter my subscription

Institutional subscribers: one year, \$490.00 ☐  
two years, \$840.00 ☐

Non-USA airmail, \$40.00 per year; non-USA surface  
mail, \$20.00 per year additional

☐ Check enclosed ☐ Please Bill

Please charge to: ☐ MasterCard ☐ VISA

Account# \_\_\_\_\_ Exp. date \_\_\_\_\_

Signature \_\_\_\_\_

Name \_\_\_\_\_

Address \_\_\_\_\_

Zip \_\_\_\_\_

Toll-Free Subscription Service: 1-800-522-1970  
In Wash., D.C.: 785-5054 / FAX: (202) 362-2790

# In Print

Official reports and other publications of special interest to the research community

(Copies of publications listed here are available from the indicated sources—not from SGR)

**From the National Science Board, policy body of the National Science Foundation:**

**Science & Engineering Indicators: 1996** (352 pp., limited supply available without charge from NSF; also for sale by the US Government Printing Office), biennial compendium of virtually every collectable statistic on R&D and related matters, including student enrollments, degrees awarded, employment, expenditures, immigration of specialists, geographic distribution of funds and activities, patents, national output of scientific literature, public attitudes toward S&T, etc. The latest edition, weightiest ever in a series dating back to 1972, puts special emphasis on public attitudes and understanding, and reports, on the basis of extensive surveys, that the general public strongly supports science and technology, but has a limited grasp of scientific method. The big book is the basic source of data for politicians and science-policy apparatchiks alike in debates over the value and adequacy of federal R&D expenditures.

Order from: National Science Foundation, Science and Engineering Indicators, Suite 965, attn. Jennifer Bond, Arlington, Va. 22230; tel. 703/306-1777; fax 703/306-0508; e-mail: <jbond@nsf.gov>.

**From the George C. Marshall Institute, Washington Roundtable on Science and Public Policy:**

**The Big Crunch: The End of Expansion in Science** (23 pp., \$7), text of a provocative talk by David Goodstein, Vice Provost and Professor of Physics, Caltech, March 13, in Washington. Among his needles: despite a weak job market, graduate students are cherished as cheap academic labor—leading to what Goodstein described as advice from the National Academy of Sciences' Committee on Science, Engineering and Public Policy (COSEPUP) "that we not change anything in what we are doing." Under strains of competition and tight funding, he said, the peer-review system is undergoing an ethical decline. And Goodstein recalled that when he warned COSEPUP about worsening money problems in science, MIT's Phil Sharp—who won the Nobel prize soon afterwards—said, "You are wrong. I have no trouble getting funding." Goodstein comments: "Well, that is the attitude of our leaders who you are asking to make this transformation." The Marshall Institute, Chaired by Frederick Seitz, former President of the National Academy of Sciences and Rockefeller University, describes itself as "fostering and preserving the integrity of science in the public process." On the political spectrum, it's on the medium right.

Order from: The George C. Marshall Institute, 1730 M St. NW, Suite 502, Washington, DC 20036-4505; tel. 202/296-9655; fax 202/296-9714.

**Colleges of Agriculture at the Land Grant Universities: Public Service and Public Policy** (120 pp., due in August, price not yet available), says the land-grant system needs both more money and competition in research, greater emphasis on interdisciplinary and multi-institutional work, closer links to economic needs, and so forth. It's all been said before in a slew of studies that have had limited effect on research, education and extension services in the 59 original schools and follow-on establishment of 17 historically black institutions. The study notes that the US Department of Agriculture ranks low in government R&D spending, with a mere 2 percent, or \$1.5 billion, of the federal total in 1994. Of that amount, \$400 million financed research outside of USDA labs, mostly in land-grant institutions. The amount is "modest" relative to the economic importance of ag research and its high returns, the report states. Focusing on federal funding for experimental stations and extension services, the report says Washington's money should be "used more creatively to 'jump start' a variety of reforms. The report was produced by a committee chaired by Anthony S. Earl, of Quarles and Brady Law Firm, Madison, Wisconsin. Nicole Ballenger of the Academy staff was Project Director. Still available, a companion report published last fall: **Colleges of Agriculture at the Land Grant Universities: A Profile** (144 pp., \$34.95, plus \$4 for shipping), which presents a great deal of statistical and historical data about the land-grant educational system.

Order from: National Academy Press, 2101 Constitution Ave. NW, Washington, DC 20418; tel. 1-800/624-6242 or 202/334-3313.

**From the US Bureau of the Census and the NIH National Institute on Aging:**

**65+ in the United States** (GPO Stock No. 803-005-10043-0; 157 pp., \$16), extensive data on the growing population of the elderly in the US, a group whose statutorily protected retirement and health costs increasingly impinge on discretionary public spending, including research. Much of the current maneuvering in Washington centers on how to restrain the entitlements of the elderly without incurring political retribution.

The statistical information here ranges widely, including state-by-state populations, income, health, work and marital status, projections for coming decades, and some international comparisons. The 65-and-older population increased 11-fold from 1900 to 1994 while the under-65 group grew only 3-fold. Growth in the elderly ranks will be modest until 2010, the report states, but will then increase sharply as Baby Boomers reach 65. In 1994, 65s and above totaled 33.2 million, of whom 11 million were in the 75-84 range and 3.5 million 85 or older. The latter group, known as the "oldest old," may more than double by 2020 and could reach 27 million by 2050, under the highest projections of life expectancy and immigration.

Order from: Superintendent of Documents, USGPO, PO Box 371954, Pittsburgh, Pa. 15250; tel. 202/512-1800; fax 202/512/2250.

(Continued on Page 7)



